NATIONALISM TODAY

The Radical Voice of British Nationalism

40p



KARL MARX

AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE

SPECIAL ANTI-COMMUNIST ISSUE!

NATIONALISM TODAY
The Radical Voice of British Nationalism

50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey
CRO 2QF.
Tel. 01-684-0271

Editor: Joe Pearce

Editorial Staff:
Nick Griffin, Nick Wakeling, Jim Capes, John Field, Steve Brady.

Nationalism Today is the radical voice of British Nationalism. It is printed, published and distributed by the N.T.Press. Editorially it supports the National Front.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors – and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor, *N.T.* or the National Front.

The appearance of any advertisement in *Nationalism Today* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in, or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

The Editor is pleased to receive manuscripts of articles from readers for possible publication. These should be typed in double-spacing, and normally be no longer than 1,250 words. No payment is made for articles published – which become *N.T.* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgement require such alteration to be made.

The Editor is also pleased to receive for possible publication private, non-copyrighted photographs. These should normally be black and white. If unused, they will only be returned if a suitable stamped addressed envelope is provided.

Those wishing to re-print articles from *Nationalism Today* must gain the permission of the Editor and under-take to include with the re-printed article the author's name – and the name and address of *Nationalism Today*.

EDITORIAL

Issue No. 13

PUTTING MARXISM ON THE DEFENSIVE

IF capitalism is the sickness which has afflicted our society over the past few centuries, then Marxism is the drug most commonly prescribed to cure it. Consequently, those sections of the population who have felt the ill affects of capitalism most are the same sections who have received an overdose of the Marxist drug.

Marxism has now permeated its way through the whole system and large sections of the population now believe its message to be the gospel truth. They believe that only revolutionary Marxist socialism can save them from capitalism, they believe dogmatically that it is the **only** solution. Marxism has become the opiate of the people.

This situation is distressing to those people who know the true nature of capitalism, simply because they know that Marxism can never solve the major problems created by a capitalist society. Karl Marx **never** proffered any real alternative to capitalism and those people who accept his analysis of the problem have a fool for a doctor. Marxism can never be the solution to the capitalist disease simply because, in reality, it is only an extension of the very disease for which it perports to be the cure. It is about time the workers of this country became aware of that fact so that they may learn the error of their ways and turn, at last, to the only ideology which offers the real solution to society's problems.

For this reason, this particular issue of *Nationalism Today* is an anti-communist special. The middle four pages of this issue form an anti-Marxist supplement which is dedicated to a true understanding of Marxism. Joe Pearce's article on page ten exposes the striking similarities which exist between the apparent opposite ideologies of communism and capitalism, while Nick Griffin's article on page eleven pinpoints the anti-working class nature of various Marxist regimes. Meanwhile, on page 12, Dave Stevens – himself an ex-communist who has recognised the error of his ways – outlines the way forward for the workers of Britain.

All in all, this centre-page supplement is a damning indictment of communism and, in order to ensure that its anti-Marxist message reaches as many people as possible, it is also going to be sold separately as a broadsheet. All those readers of *N.T.* who would like to help expose the anti-British and anti-working class nature of communism should buy extra supplies of this broadsheet to sell or give away to their friends and workmates. For twenty copies of the centre-page supplement just send £1.60 and we will send them to you straight away, **postage paid by us!** Cheques and postal orders should be sent to *Nationalism Today*, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF and should be made payable to *Nationalism Today*.

HOME AFFAIRS

"Give us back our Asians!"

IN 1972, the Tories allowed tens of thousands of Asians to flood into Britain after the Ugandan Government of Idi Amin drove them out. Now the post-Amin Ugandan Government wants the Asians back. Without their business abilities, the Ugandan economy has collapsed. Unless the Asians return and rebuild that economy, thousands more Ugandan Blacks will starve.

The Ugandan Deputy Finance Minister, Henry Makmot, recently addressed 400 Ugandan Asian community representatives from all parts of Britain, in a North London school. He explained his Government's new Expropriation of Properties Bill, which will give the expelled Asians back the businesses confiscated from them by Amin. The Bill, he said, was aimed at encouraging the Asians to go back to Uganda.

The Ugandan Minister told his Asian audience: "We would like you to come and settle in Uganda. Uganda will welcome back all her citizens."

Like the earlier declaration by the Government of Guyana, that it would welcome Britain's entire Black population as settlers, this Ugandan call for their Asians to return from Britain shows that the repatriation of Coloured Immigrants advocated by the NF is a perfectly feasible and humane proposition. Many Immigrants want to go, and many Third World countries want to have them. Indeed, like Uganda they need their skills desperately. Back in their own countries, among their own people, with their abilities in desperate demand, Britain's Coloured Immigrants would be far better off, and far happier.

More Blacks in Blue

ATTEMPTS to get more Blacks to join the police force have been stepped up since publication of the Scarman report. Special campaigns with meetings, discussions, advertising in various languages and open days for immigrants at police stations are all being used to induce more Blacks to enroll in the various constabularies up and down the country.

About 100 applications have been received following the recent extensive recruitment campaigns but police chiefs are still not satisfied. Although they have described the response as encouraging they have stated that "we would like more than this".

Apparently, the main reason that there are not even more recruits from the racial minorities into the police force is the failure of most applicants to "reach the required level of qualification". However, this minor obstacle is being overcome by special training courses, sponsored by the police, especially for prospective Black recruits.

Meanwhile, while these attempts to blacken the face of the police force continue, there are plans afoot to get the cops to become even more repressive towards White racialists. William Whitelaw, in conjunction with the Marxist Joint Committee Against Racism, has submitted proposals that special squads of police should be set up to combat offences of a "racialist nature". Whitelaw has submitted these proposals to the Association of Chief Police Officers Racial Attacks Sub-Committee. These attacks of a "racialist nature" are **not** believed to include attacks by marauding gangs of Black youths on defenceless White old ladies.

BENJAMIN DISRAELI

"No man will treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key of history, and why history is so often confused is that it has been written by men who were ignorant of this principle and all the knowledge it involves."

– From *Endymion, II.*

Labour still the party of the Immigrants

ALTHOUGH Tory Governments let in the great majority of Britain's Coloured Immigrants, Labour certainly seems to fall over itself to help them once they're here. According to figures recently published by the Community Relations Executive in its *New Equals* paper, of the Councillors of "New Commonwealth and Pakistani origin" elected in the London Borough elections on May 6th, 1982, no less than 69 were Labour. Tories, Liberals and Independents could muster only 8 Coloured councillors between them. Thanks largely to Labour, the number of Coloured councillors in London shot up from 41 to 77.

. . . but the SDP would like to be . . .

ADDRESSING a meeting during the Social Democrats' Assembly in Derby on October 13th, SDP leader David Owen said that the SDP would have to go for the Black vote if they were to stand any chance of winning the next election.

"At the moment," he admitted, "their loyalties are very firmly with the Labour Party. In the inner cities the Labour Party is getting a very strong automatic vote still."

"But," the SDP leader went on, "it can easily shift. Our philosophy is a natural one for many of the ethnic minorities. We have got to get after their attitudes and their thoughts, and then we will get the votes."

. . . so would the Tories

GROVELLING to the Asians has seemed to have paid-up well. For Tory MP's Rhodes Boyson and William Whitelaw found themselves the object of much affection when they attended the presentation of the first *Garavi Gujaret* annual book awards for racial harmony.

"The community of Asian businessmen are all realising that their real interests lies with the Conservatives," explained Jayvantsinhji Gohel, Chairman of the Anglo-Asian Conservative Society, during the awards. "We all want to be millionaires, you see."

Garavi Gujaret is an Asian news weekly which has inaugurated an annual prize of £1000 for the book which best promotes racial harmony in the U.K.

The Home Secretary, presenting the prize to Rukshana Smith for her novel *Sumitra's Story*, paid tribute to the work of the anti-British Commission for Racial Equality.

NATIONALIST BOOKS

The NF's mail order book service. A full range of titles of interest to Nationalists and Racialists. Send 20p for list to: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey.

THE COMMON MARKET TEN YEARS ON

by Tom Acton

AT THE BEGINNING of January Britain "celebrated" ten years membership of the Common Market. After a decade of propaganda by pro-EEC politicians, the media, big-business front organisations like the European Movement, and the EEC itself, this is an appropriate time to look at a few of the hard facts of membership. As a comprehensive analysis of the EEC's shortcomings would more than fill *NT* this article concentrates on four main areas for concern.

Financial Costs of Membership. Every time some ailing concern receives an EEC subsidy the media is quick to hail it as another example of Common Market benevolence saving British industry and helping the fight against unemployment. Heavily played down, however, is the fact that it's the British taxpayer who has to fork up the money in the first place.

In fact Britain has to pay into the EEC, by way of VAT contributions, food levies, and import tariffs, a massively greater amount than it actually gets back in grants and subsidies. Between the date of joining, and the end of 1981 Britain had paid into the EEC some £8800 million, yet it got back subsidies and grants worth only £5500 million. In other words three and a half **Billion** pounds were sucked out of the British economy – over one million pounds per day – substantially harming investment and employment prospects.

Trade. Remember all the promises that were made at the time of the EEC referendum? The elimination of tariff barriers between Britain and the Continent would give our industries access to one of the biggest consumer markets in the world it was claimed. The fact that industries based on the continent would also have free access to the British market went largely ignored.

What makes this so undesirable is the fact that in an integrated European economic system Britain is fatally hindered as a result of its peripheral location, relative to the rest of the EEC. As more and more major industries come to be dominated by fewer and fewer multinational concerns the elimination of trade barriers and Exchange Control regulations means that they can rationalise their production from a Continent-wide perspective, in order to reap the fullest benefits from economies of scale. Increasingly the trend is for multinational organisations to shut down their smaller, peripheral production lines, and to reinvest their funds in modernising and enlarging those production centres that are nearest and most convenient to their major consumer markets.

The much vaunted 300 million strong EEC market has merely acted as a magnet, drawing industrial production out of Britain – with its relatively insignificant consumer market – into the main industrial centres in Germany, France, Holland etc, where there is much easier and cheaper access to the massive Continental market than from Britain.

DEFICIT

Proof that this is happening is shown by a comparison of Britain's Balance of Trade with the EEC before and after membership. In the seven years before joining Britain had an average surplus on trade in manufatured goods with EEC countries of £300 million each year. In the first seven years afterwards, as Britain was forced to import goods previously made here, there was an average annual **deficit** of £1300 million, which has now increased to £5,500 million a year.

Common Market apologists point out that in recent years Britain has made an equally large surplus by exporting North Sea oil to EEC countries – an argument which is largely irrelevant. By the end of the century, when the oil starts to run out, large sections of Britains industrial base will effectively have been "exported" to the Continent, and the long-term effect on employment will be catastrophic.

The Common Agricultural Policy and the Soviet Union. One aspect of Britain's membership that the Establishment can't keep quiet about – since it has affected the value of the pound in everyone's pocket – is the shambolic state of European farming under the Common Agricultural Policy. The end results are clear enough for anyone to see: prices substantially higher than before entry, and massive structural surpluses in many farming products, leading to the creation of "butter mountains" and "wine lakes" etc. The only way these surpluses can be disposed off is on the world markets, at a huge loss and with the aid of massive subsidies.

Foodstuff, which UK consumers have to buy at exorbitant EEC-determined prices, are sold at a fraction of the cost to the Soviet Union, which is one of the few major importers of food in the world.

Thus, at a time when British taxpayers have to pay billions every year for Defence, the EEC, by helping to feed the Russian people, enables the Soviet Government to devote more manpower and resources to its military development. The Soviet Union doesn't have to choose between "Guns and Butter" – while they produce the guns the EEC supplies the (subsidised) butter!

NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Is Britain a nation or not? This last point is the most fundamental of all. National independance – the right of free peoples to determine their own destinies – is of greater fundamental importance than short-term financial gains or losses.

The differing peoples of Europe each have their own distinct needs and aspirations – economic, social, political and cultural. Rule by a Brussels bureaucracy inevitably means the standardisation (or "harmonisation" as Euro-jargon euphemistically puts it) of Europe, and the creation of a grim, grey, uniform "EEC way of life". The marketing managers of international conglomerates may yearn for the day when everyone in Europe wears the same clothes, eats the same foods, buys the same records, and drives the same cars, but to Nationalists that vision constitutes an avoidable nightmare.

Even if Britain did get more back in subsidies, than it contributes in levies, it would still be a disastrous blunder in the long run to surrender our national identity and right of self-determination, to the faceless Bankers, Bureaucrats and Super-Capitalists who control the EEC. The fact that we are paying through the nose for the destruction of the British as a free and independant people merely adds financial injury to national insult!

GET BRITAIN OUT NOW!

HOME AFFAIRS

A WORK OF ART?

A SYMBOLIC statement on the technological revolution... or a pile of rusting junk? Whatever your artistic point of view, the inescapable fact is that YOU – the taxpayer – have just paid out £23,000 for two scrap cars squashed together by a compressing machine.

For following the Tate Gallery's purchase of a collection of bricks in the name of art six years ago, this latest artistic masterpiece – pictured right – is now standing in the Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art in Edinburgh.

French-Italian sculptor Cesar Baldaccini "created" it in the flower power era of 1966. Titled Compression 1966, it stands six feet high and is said to "reflect 20th century artistic thinking".

The Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art – which gets £500,000 in Government grants each year – bought the sculpture from a London "art" dealer.

It had been in the artist's own collection since he "created" it.

The decision to buy the pile of junk was defended by the gallery's assistant keeper, Mr. Keith Hartley. He said: "We have to do our duty and try to present 20th century art to the people of Scotland and we would be failing in our duty if, from time to time, we did not shock people's sensitivities.

"We have to be honest about what is happening in art."

He added: "But you are not just buying two wrecked cars of course. It is the way it is done and the very idea of doing it in the first place."

Culturally, the National Front believes that one of man's freedoms is the freedom of the racial-soul to express and manifest itself – without interference – through works of creative genius.

Towards this end, we believe that the whole community must lend its enthusiastic and unstinting support.

ALIEN INFLUENCES

We also believe that the State bears a special responsibility to protect the racial-soul from the harmful effects of distorting alien influences – in art, literature, music, drama, entertainment, education and scientific inquiry – and to establish those standards by which true British character and ideals can be reflected, and the questioning spirit of our race expressed.

Indeed the National Front demands that the State encourages and promotes every genuine form of British expression.

We also demand that the State subsidise pure scientific research as well as the exploration of outer space.

We further demand the removal of all alien influences from the cultural life of the United Kingdom, and the elimination of the cult of ugliness and insanity known as "modern art".

"Artistic" crap like Compression 1966 should therefore be scrapped and lunatic "artists" like Cesar Baldaccini, and equally mad Art Gallery curators such as Keith Hartley should be treated with the amused contempt they deserve.

LABOUR 1984

A FUTURE Labour Government would openly support violent Black vigilantes, would openly support the IRA's murder campaign in Northern Ireland, would disarm Britain and would support the Soviet Union!

All of this was revealed in a Labour Party Young Socialist policy statement which was published in the October 1982 issue of *Class Fighter*. Sections of the policy statement reads as follows:

"Fight racism. Purge racists from all positions in the labour movement. Organise to drive fascists off the streets."

"Troops out of Ireland now! Political status for Republican prisoners. Repeal the Prevention of Terrorism Act. Support the Labour Committee on Ireland. Support **all** actions in solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggle in the North of Ireland."

"Build CND. Fight to draw youth from CND into the struggle for socialist policies in the labour movement. The war drive comes from imperialism! **Defend the Soviet Union!**"

We dare call it Treason

IN the midst of the recent spy scandals involving Communist traitors in the Civil Service betraying defence secrets to the Russians at Cheltenham and elsewhere, it is worth bringing to mind the remarks of Tory columnist Peregrine Worsthorne, writing in the Tory *Sunday Telegraph* in November 1979.

Describing his reaction if he were to be approached by an American CIA agent asking for his help in overthrowing a democratically-elected British Government which had pursued policies of which he disapproved, such as the long-standing NF policy of withdrawing Britain from NATO, this bastion of the Tory Establishment wrote:

"Coming from the representative of any other foreign power, such a request would not be entertained by me for a moment. But the United States is not just any other foreign power. I am, and always have been, passionately pro-American, in the sense of believing that the United States has long been the protector of all the values which I hold most dear. To that extent, my attitude to the United States has always been that of a potential fellow traveller."

This is hardly surprising. Just as Communists owe their first loyalty to Communist Russia, so Capitalists can be expected to owe their first loyalty to Capitalist America. We in the National Front owe no shred of loyalty to either superpower. We are loyal to Britain. And for 'fellow travellers of America or the Soviets, for traitors of the 'Right' just as for traitors of the 'Left', the penalty for treason, for betraying our nation and our people, will be exactly the same.

National Front News
A broadsheet published monthly in support of the National Front. Subscriptions only for 5 copies or more. 12 issues of 5 copies £9.00.

IT'S TOUGH AT THE TOP



BRITAIN'S WORKERS have "gone bonkers over pay", according to the President of the Confederation of British Industry, Sir Campbell Fraser. "We have paid ourselves too much," he went on, attacking trade union demands for pay rises to keep up with the increased cost of living. Other top bosses in the C.B.I. have gone even further and demanded that workers should take a pay CUT.

But the crocodile tears they shed for British industry would be more convincing if they followed their own advice. In fact, it is the managers and chairmen of industry who have "gone bonkers over pay" – just look at the facts:

■ Tiny Rowland, the tycoon behind the Lonrho empire, has given himself a pay RISE of £500 a WEEK. He now gets £251,650 a year.

■ Patrick Sergeant, director of Associated Newspapers, "earned" £255,000 last year. As city editor of the *Daily Mail*, he is forever telling ordinary Britons that their greed has brought the country to its knees.

■ Two executives in Maxwell Joseph's Metropolitan Hotels group collected around £255,000 each last year.

■ The Chairman of Lucas Industries, Godfrey Meservy, got a little extra windfall as well. In spite of company losses of £34.6 million, his pay rose from £31,947 to £127,145 – almost a fourfold increase!

■ Denis Allport, Chairman of Metal Box, admitted to shareholders that the recession was hitting the company badly. His salary of £86,000, plus expenses and a hefty pension scheme, can't exactly be helping!

■ The list could go on and on. The perks alone for many top bosses are more than most people could ever hope to earn. David Wickins of British Car Auctions, for example, gets a company house, three cars, a plane and a helicopter. Robb Wilmot of ICL, paid £29,132 towards the cost of his luxury home. The company chipped in a bit too – £262,192!

And these people have the cheek to tell ordinary Britons that we are "overpaid and greedy". The truth is that they are the parasites who are ripping off both their workers and the small share-holders in their unfortunate companies.

BLATANT HYPOCRISY

Their blatant hypocrisy shows that they simply don't care what the rest of us think about them. They seem to live in a different world. Perhaps they do – look at what Lord Forte told the *Daily Mirror* recently: "I've so many shares that whatever I sell, I'd still be a very rich man. To me, something like £1½ million is spare change."

Lord Forte is not a Jew, unlike many of the other top parasites. But Nationalists must realise that, in this case, race is irrelevant anyway. This situation would be just as bad if all of those concerned were of sound British stock; the very system that creates such grotesque inequalities is rotten. It's no good just blaming the rats – we must destroy the capitalist sewer they breed in!

WAITING FOR HOMES

AT THE latest count, there were over 250,000 homeless people in Britain. At least another 5 million 'live' in what can only be described as slums.

Council housing waiting lists are longer than ever – and growing all the time. At the same time, both council and private house-building are at an all time low!

And yet, in this 'free' country of ours, over 350,000 construction workers are on the dole!

However, for some people housing presents no problem. If you have a mere £½ million to spare, you can pick up some really good bargains in London. Apparently London is the "in" place for the *elite* of the world. These creatures think nothing of forking out £1,000 a week for rent.

So, if you are struggling with a mortage, living on a vast concrete jungle of a housing estate, existing in a multi-racial slum area or even have no home at all – then cheer yourself up. Take a walk around the plush areas of London where the rich whoop it up – and thank Capitalism for the 'wonderful' system that it provides for us all.

Higher taxes under the Tories

BRITAIN'S burden of taxation has increased by five per cent since the Tories came to power in May 1979. It has risen sharply from 34 per cent of national income in 1978 to 39 per cent in 1981 according to Christopher Johnson, group economic adviser at Lloyds Bank.

This large rise in the tax burden exposes the Tory lie that taxes are decreased when they are in power. Many people have been led to believe that the Conservatives reduce taxes simply because they always make a point of reducing **direct** taxation, such as income tax, whenever they are in office. However, this reduction in direct taxation has been more than made up by large tax increases in other areas. This heavy taxation under the Tories is levied in the form of **indirect** taxes – taxes on goods and services such as VAT. In other words, the Thatcher Government has been deceptively levying less noticeable indirect taxes 'on the quiet', while making a big show of reducing income tax. **Thus many British people have been led to believe that taxes have been reduced when, in fact, the very opposite is the case!**

Although taxes have risen in real terms since 1978, the tax burden has been magnified even further by falls in output of over 2 per cent in both 1980 and 1981.

While it is true that personal income tax has indeed fallen as a percentage of the overall burden – in 1976 it was 38.2 per cent, while by 1981 it had dropped to 29.3 per cent – this will not help the British worker in any way at all. On the contrary, as Mr Johnson so rightly points out, this drop in personal income tax will only help the most highly paid sections of the population. It may have given better incentives to some higher rate taxpayers but for most people it was more than offset by a rise in the share of other kinds of tax in the total.

Taxes on goods and services, mainly VAT, rose from 26.6 per cent of taxes in 1978 to almost 30 per cent in 1980.

So when all the facts are taken into account it can be seen that the Tory claim that they've reduced taxes is nothing more than a dirty con trick. All that they've done, as is so often the case under reactionary Conservative *regimes*, is to rob the poor in order to give to the rich.

Read

CANDOUR

The magazine started by the National Front's first chairman, A. K. Chesterton, is now available from the Nationalist Bookshop. Send 50p for sample copy to 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

Putting a name to the hidden hand

WHEN Margaret Thatcher stepped off her RAF VC10 airliner in Peking at the start of her visit to Red China in September, a 63-year old Chinaman with prominent eyebrows was waiting on the tarmac to greet her. Immediately after Mrs. T. had a private audience with Chinese Leader Deng Xiaoping in the Great Hall of the People, in went the same Chinaman, for his private audience with China's Communist chief. Throughout the British Prime Minister's tour of Red China, this same Chinamen was constantly within a few steps of her party, cracking jokes with Deng Xiaoping and even managing a few games of golf with Denis Thatcher. Finally, at the VIP Farewell Dinner given for the Thatchers by the Governor of Hong Kong just before they returned home, the little yellow man with the big black eyebrows was in attendance as an honoured guest once again.

Who was this enigmatic Chinaman? Some important Red Chinese official? Dr. Fu Manchu? Actually, this *confidante* of Red Chinese Communists and Capitalist British Tories is Sir Yue-Kong 'YK' Pao, C.B.E., Justice of the Peace, millionaire shipowner, "the Onassis of Hong Kong". He is also on very good terms with Deng and Red China's Politburo. One of the World's richest Capitalists, owner of 20 million tons of shipping and a vast property and transport empire in Hong Kong, he is also a personal friend and close political collaborator of the leaders of the World's biggest Communist empire. Several of his tankers and bulk carriers have been built at Red Chinese shipyards, providing YK with low costs thanks to cheap Communist slave labour, free from any right

to strike or trade union 'lefty' rubbish, and giving the Red millions in foreign exchange vital to their economy. Indeed, during her China visit, Mrs. Thatcher launched YK's tanker 'World Goodwill' at Shanghai. The audience at the launching were seemingly a bizarre blend of the Mayor of Red Shanghai and his Communist Party officials and most of Hong Kong's leading Capitalists.

LINK MAN

As his confidential *tete-a-tete* with Deng straight after the Red Chinese boss had his private chat with Maggie shows, YK Pao is a lot more influential in Peking and a lot less anti-Communist, than his apparent role as a Hong Kong Capitalist shipping magnate might suggest. In fact, he is a key link man between International Capitalism and the Chinese wing of International Communism. Just like Armand Hammer, who has never let his Chairmanship of the Occidental Oil Capitalist multinational get in the way of his personal and business friendships with Lenin, Stalin, Khruschev and Brezhnev, Sir YK Pao is living proof that the relationship between Capitalism and Communism at the very top is rather different from the mutual animosity spouted in Red papers and the *Daily Telegraph*. Flitting from Capitalist boardroom to Communist Presidium, fixing lucrative East-West trade deals, manipulating political puppets, and all the time keeping out of the public eye, men like Pao and Hammer are members of a power elite the world rarely sees or hears of. Yet they are far more powerful than many household political names, even Presidents and Prime Ministers.

COMMON AIM

And the reason they can tie East and West so cosily together over a few drinks and a word in the right ear? The fact that both Eastern Communism and Western Capitalism depend on each other economically and share a common aim: One World. If ever a World State comes, it will not be the global free democratic society its advocates extoll. It will be a rigid bureaucratic tyranny of money and power. And the men who run it will be sinister men of the shadows like Sir Y.K. Pao. We, on the other hand, will simply be serfs, interchangeable production/consumption units bereft of nation, race, culture and freedom. Y.K. Pao, C.B.E., J.P., may not be Dr. Fu Manchu, but he is more sinisterly powerful, and his ends more evil, than Sax Rohmer's Yellow Peril ever was.

Begin fulfills his pledge

ACCORDING to Sol Linowitz in a recent issue of *Time* magazine Begin "prides himself on being a man of his word, on doing what he says he is going to do. He takes badly the allegation that he does not abide by his commitments."

Two statements come to mind that confirm that Begin is indeed a man of his word.

In a letter in May 1963 Ben Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, stated that Begin was "a thoroughly Hitlerite type, ready to destroy all the Arabs... When for the first time I heard Begin on the radio, I heard the voice and the screeching of Hitler."

As for Begin himself, he stated in 1956:

"You shall have no pity on them until we have destroyed their so-called Arab culture, on the ruins of which we will build our own civilisation."

Mass Murder — Justice Jewish Style!



IAN ANDERSON

A NEW SYSTEM OF FINANCE

THE LONDON Stock Exchange is a gambler's paradise rivalled only by Wall Street and the Casinos at Monte Carlo. It is this "Great British Institution" which is currently presiding over the most catastrophic collapse in the industrial fabric of the United Kingdom.

At the present time there are many financial parasites who are able to earn millions of pounds for themselves by their manipulations on the Stock Exchange which often result in yet more misery for the British people.

The iniquities and failures of the Stock Exchange were laid out in an article by Steve Brady (*Nationalism Today* No. 12) but it is now necessary to offer an alternative system of channelling the savings of working British people into British industry to provide a decent future for their children and to allow people a decent and honourable retirement.

The criteria upon which any system of Nationalist Investment Policy must be based are straightforward:

1) The savings of British people and the profits of British industry must be ploughed back into Britain and must not be used to build factories in Korea or railways in Uganda.

2) While it is right that the investments of individuals will provide an interest payment or dividend or some other form of return, that investment does not give the investor the right to control the business in which they invest. The control and ownership of the means of production should, wherever possible, lie **directly** with the workers in that factory.

REMOTE ANCESTORS

With the elimination of the disgusting accumulations of capital that have been passed down from remote ancestors to their current owners and with the break up of the multinational monopolies the chief sources of investment capital will be the pension funds and the savings of British working people.

At present these savings are held with privately owned institutions; pension funds are lodged with banks or finance houses, while savings are in the form of investment trusts. While technically the ownership of these sources of capital lies with the original working people, the **control** lies with a small tightly knit financial community based in the City of London who have scant regard for the interests of Britain or the British people.

If a nationalist government is to seriously control the destiny of this country then the control of this money must be either directly in the hands of the people or in the hands of the elected Government.

For this reason the only organisation which could be allowed to handle the pension funds of the British people must be the British Government. Under such a system it would be necessary to improve the Basic State Pension Scheme to which everyone would have to contribute according to their means. This would provide a guaranteed state pension to everyone on retirement and the funds would be invested as directed by the Government.

It would also be possible for the Government to provide a wide range of additional schemes to supplement such a pension and to cater for other forms of savings and which would allow the subscribers, if they wish, to determine the direction of their investment.

For example Mr Smith might wish to invest a sum of money in the alternative energy industry. While he may then achieve a higher return on such an investment than if he had allowed the state to determine the direction in which his funds are invested, he will also carry the consequent risk of a lower rate of return if the industry does not do as well as he expected.

It goes without saying that the type of scheme which would **not** be offered by the Government would be a "Far Eastern Investment Scheme" or a "High Technology American Investment Scheme".

"INVESTMENT SHOPS"

To administer the type of scheme evisaged it would be necessary to set up a very widespread chain of "investment shops" in the High Streets of Britain.

As far as most companies or businesses are concerned the prime source of investment if not the largest would be directly from the workers in that firm. Such co-operatives would be vigorously encouraged and workers would be almost automatically granted loans, if needed, to provide their initial investment in these enterprises.

However it must be accepted that many if not most firms would require substantial additional capital either to set up or to expand. Some of this required capital would be provided by a Government controlled, but possibly localised, investment agency. Firms would apply for capital in the same way that they now apply to banks or to finance houses.

Firms which wish to ask the public directly for capital would still be able to do so. They would offer "shares" for sale to the public, but such shares would be subject to restrictions to prevent the loss of control by the workers in a company and to prevent the emergence of a black market stock exchange.

Thus the shares would have to be in the form of loan or debenture shares which, while they provide a return on investment depending on the success or otherwise of the company, give no control over that company. They would not be transferable from one individual to another and investors would have to commit their money for a set period probably with a minimum of five years.

REGISTRATION

A basic and simple form of registration by both company and by investor would prevent the emergence of share dealing and the formation of monopolies by one firm buying out another.



This computerised control system was built by British workers at the Chippenham-based Automation and Controls Division of the Westingham Brake and Signal Company. Under the present financial system all of the profits made by the labour of British workers of this company can be drained out of the economy by the parent company in America.

In this way it would be possible to maintain flexibility of finance for industry while ensuring that never again would a small group of largely alien parasites be able to wield the enormous financial and consequently political influence that they have today. Financial and political power would be fully restored to the British people.

There would still be a number of industries where the above system would have to be modified. For example a very high technology factory whose equipment and assets may be worth tens or even hundreds of millions of pounds but which only has a very small workforce cannot fit into such a system. In this case the factory would have to be brought directly under community control as would some industries which are vital to national security.

While there will be other exceptions to the very broadly described financial system being proposed it is essential that the current international financial system is replaced by one which serves the British people. The transfer of vast sums of capital around the world on the whim of a Rothschild or a Rockefeller must cease. There must be absolutely no ownership of British industry by foreign individuals or foreign companies. Similarly British capital must be invested in Britain. The only organisation that must have the right to transfer capital across our borders is the Government.

FINANCIAL EMPIRE

The Stock Exchange and the City of London finance houses are at the centre of a financial empire which has served the interests of the financiers, the banks and the multinational companies. It is now wrecking British industry and it must be destroyed.

It must be a priority of a nationalist government to set up a financial structure which serves the needs of British industry and the British people. Until this is done the very major economic problems facing Britain are incapable of being solved.

All the proposed or actual tinkerings of Margaret Thatcher or Michael Foot can achieve nothing while the very core and basis of industrial finance in Britain is so sated with corruption.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE REDS!

HOW often do you hear liberals and 'socialists' of one variety or another complaining that people are 'prejudiced against communism'? If only people understood Marxism properly, the line goes, then they would realise that communism is the most wonderful, humanitarian and progressive philosophy the world has ever known. OK then, let's look at communism, its principles, the people who invented it, and the people who advocate it today.

How many of the founders of communism were actually 'workers'?

Karl Marx's father was a middle class Jewish lawyer. Friedrich Engels was born into a wealthy German-Jewish family who owned textile factories in Germany and England. Lenin's father was a middle-class civil servant who was a regional Director of Education. Trotsky was born into a well-off family of Jewish landowners.

How many used their real names?

Lenin's real name was Ulyanov. Trotsky's was Bronstein. Stalin's was Djugashvili. Zinoviev's was Apfelbaum. Radek's was Sobelsohn. Parvus was originally Israel Helphand.

What sort of income did they rely on?

Engels did not work, but instead he lived off the capitalist profits of his family's textile business, gained through the exploitation of cheap sweated labour in their mills. Engels also kept Marx and his family from the breadline, although Marx was always pestering him for more. Marx once wrote to Engels complaining that he had been obliged to pawn the maid's shoes in order to pay for his daughter's private education. (Ref.: *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx*, Dietz, Stuttgart, 1921). Parvus became a millionaire as the managing director of a company which imported German coal to Denmark, under the suspices of the Danish Communist Party. Lenin relied on funds from the German government, as did Trotsky. While Trotsky was in New York he also received financial assistance from mysterious sources on Wall Street. Although at the time he was supposedly only earning 12 dollars a week as a journalist, he could still afford his own chauffeur. (Ref.: Leon Trotsky, *My Life*, Chap. 22).

How many of today's communist leaders in Britain are actually 'workers'?

Very few. The leader of the Socialist Workers Party is a man who goes by the name of "Tony Cliff". He is an Israeli citizen whose real name is Ygael Gluckstein. Gluckstein's 'South African' wife is another leading member of the SWP. She, like her husband, also uses a variety of assumed names – Chanie Rosenberg being the main one. Her brother, who goes by the name of Michael Kidron, is a millionaire who financed the SWP's printing company Pluto Press.

Another leading member of the Socialist Workers Party is Paul Foot who is now a regular columnist in the *Daily Mirror*. Foot is the son of the wealthy Lord Caradon who used to be Britain's representative at the United Nations. His uncle is Michael Foot, leader of the Labour Party.

The Workers Revolutionary Party claims to be the most dedicated of all the Trotskyite parties but it still manages to provide a comfortable niche for such un-proletarian types as Vanessa Redgrave, the wealthy actress, and Michael Banda, the son of a Ceylon plantation magnate.

The International Marxist Group used to be run by a Pakistani, Tariq Ali, whose landowning family were wealthy enough to send him to Oxford. Ali has since left the IMG and has applied to join the Labour Party. Also high up in the International Marxist Group is Teresa Hayter, the *debutante* daughter of a former ambassador.

The leader of the Marxist wing of the Labour Party is Tony Benn, a wealthy member of the British aristocracy who rejoices in the title of Viscount Stansgate.

Who financed the Bolshevik take-over?

Germany undoubtedly contributed large sums of money to the Bolshevik conspirators, since the Bolsheviks had promised to take Russia out of the First World War by surrendering over a million square miles of Russian territory to Germany. But pro-German and pro-Bolshevik elements amongst the Wall Street banking fraternity also gave vast amounts of money. Jacob Schiff, a senior partner in the Wall Street banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. contributed over twenty million dollars to the Bolsheviks. This was admitted by his grandson John in the *New York Journal-American* of February 4th 1949. A million dollars was also contributed by Walter Boyce Thompson of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, according to a *Washington Post* report of February 2nd 1918.

What proportion of the Bolsheviks were of Russian origin?

In his evidence before a committee of the United States on February 12th 1919, the Rev. George Simons of the Methodist Church of Petrograd reported that: "Out of 388 members of the Petrograd Soviet only 16 happened to be real Russians; one man is a Negro from North America... and 265 of the rest come from the Lower East Side of New York."

The widow of the then correspondent of the *Guardian* in Russia, Mrs. Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams, reported in *From Liberty to Brest-Litovsk* that: "There are few Russians among the Bolshevist wire-pullers. Some of them had never been to Russia before. The nation over which they had seized power was a stranger to them, and besides they behaved as invaders in a conquered country."

MARX, ENGELS AND LENIN. None of these three self-appointed "working-class heroes" were real workers at all.

How has the Soviet Union kept going?

There is no such thing as Soviet technology. That is the conclusion reached by Professor Anthony Sutton after ten years of research into East-West trade, published as *National Suicide*, Arlington House, 1973. Since 1918 the United States and Western Europe have supplied 95% of all Soviet technology. Stalin himself paid tribute to this aid, observing that two-thirds of all large industrial enterprises in the USSR had been built with United States help. Potential famine and perhaps political revolution in the Soviet Union have been staved off in successive years because the West, particularly the United States, has obliged with cheap or even taxpayer-subsidised sales of grain.

But isn't communism the direct opposite of capitalism?

Communism, in many ways, is very similar to capitalism. Both support and have fostered the mass migration of coloured immigrants from the 'Third World' to the countries of the West. Both believe in the centralisation of industrial control in the hands of a privileged few; in the case of capitalism control is vested with relatively few super-powerful multi-national corporations and international financial concerns, while under communism control is vested with a handful of Party bosses and State bureaucrats. Under both systems the mass of the population are denied any control over the industrial concerns in which they work.

Produced by WORKERS AGAINST MARXISM 10p

JOE PEARCE

COMMUNISM: The False "Alternative"

CAPITALISM is permanently afflicted by the evils of unemployment and excessive taxation. These, and a multiplicity of other economic problems, appear to be an inherent part of the capitalist economic system. It is not surprising then that many people, recognising that these problems are self-evidently unjust, are beginning to search around for an alternative economic order which will at last bring justice to the British people.

Without doubt, the most widely accepted 'alternative' to capitalism is Marxist socialism. It really is a tragedy that this should be the case because as regards the really important facts of economic life, both capitalism and communism are essentially the same.

INTERNATIONALIST

Communism, like capitalism, is internationalist. Both systems are vehemently opposed to the concept of the independent nation state and they see the sovereignty of individual states as being contrary to the fundamental principles of their respective ideologies. Both systems favour the establishment of a single, all powerful World State which will preside over the affairs of all nations and all people. This is the ultimate dictatorship.

The inherent internationalism of both communism and capitalism alike is epitomised by their united advocacy of the free movement of labour and capital. Both systems believe that labour and capital should be free to move anywhere in the world without hinderance. As such, they are hostile to the existence of national barriers which prevent this movement from occuring as freely as they would like.

The support of both capitalism and communism to the free movement of labour can be readily seen by the support given by both to the massive influx of immigrants into Britain. Immigrants were originally brought to this country at the behest of Big Business in order to undercut the wages of White workers, yet this capitalist inspired and promoted immigration has been consistently supported by the Marxist Left.

The support given by both to the international free movement of capital can best be gauged by recent statements made by bulwarks of both capitalism and communism on the subject of international trade.

The 1979 Conservative Party Manifesto states: *"We are opposed to import controls. They would invite damaging retaliation against British goods overseas."* (Page 15). Meanwhile, *Socialist Worker* used exactly the same argument to justify their opposition to import controls: *"Import controls would crucify the Dustable plant which exports 70 per cent of its production and would be hard hit by any retaliation." (Socialist Worker* 24.10.81).

This argument about British manufacturers being hit by retaliation if import controls are introduced is, of course, very shallow. The fact remains that Britain imports far more than she exports and, as such, manufacturers would benefit much more from the gains to be made in the home market than they would lose from any loss caused by retaliation on the world market. It is nevertheless very interesting to note the similar arguments used by capitalism and Marxism alike in their advocacy of international 'free' trade.

However, the most striking similarity of all arises in the field of their purely economic beliefs. It is in this field that one would normally expect to find the real differences between Marxist and capitalist ideology. Yet, in the real essentials, no such differences exist.

This statement, that communism and capitalism are economically very similar, would be completely unpalateable to the Marxist economist. He would probably concede that both systems are internationalist and multi-racialist, but he would argue that economically they are very different. He would argue, quite correctly, that the concentration of private ownership in the hands of relatively few has led to many gross injustices. The conclusion he draws from this economic truth, however, is fundamentally false, and it is from this fundamental falsehood that all Marxism is based. He would claim that the concentration of private property in the hands of a few is evil and therefore private ownership should be abolished. It is here that he and all other Marxists go wrong because it is not private ownership, but the concentration of private ownership, which is wrong.

FUNDAMENTAL FALSEHOOD

This fundamental falsehood was brilliantly summed up by Douglas Hyde in his book *I Believed*. Hyde had been a leading member of the Communist Party for many years, working full time on the Communist *Daily Worker*, before learning the error of his ways. In this one passage he brilliantly sums up the folly of Marxist theory:

"For twenty years I had been troubled by the evidence of the unequal distribution of wealth and the social injustices which appeared to flow from it. I had reasoned: The unequal distribution of property gives rise to great social injustice. Therefore private property is wrong and should be abolished. Millions had reasoned along similar lines. It has influenced an entire generation.

"Now, suddenly, the slipshod character of such pre-fabricated thought struck me between the eyes. The maldistribution of property did not necessarily prove that private property was wrong in itself. If it proved anything at all it was surely that its distribution was wrong and that a means must therefore be found to spread it more evenly over the population as a whole. The formulation should have been: 'The unequal distribution of property gives rise to great social injustice. Therefore property should be more equitably distributed.'"

Douglas Hyde realised, unlike so many of his contemporaries, that the basic premise upon which Marxism is structured is completely illogical. As a result, Marxist theory is based upon the condemnation of all private property and the advocacy of complete 'public' ownership of the means of production.



This advocacy of 'public' ownership, which in reality is ownership by a handful of state bureaucrats, results in the paradoxical fact that communist economics are very similar to capitalist economics – they both lead to monopoly control of the means of production!

Under communism the means of production are controlled by a handful of state bureaucrats, while under capitalism they are controlled by a handful of immensely powerful multi-national corporations. In both cases ownership and control are vested in a very small minority while the vast majority have no say in their economic destinies whatsoever.

The other similarity between communism and capitalism, of course, is that both systems are largely controlled by aliens and alien influences. For instance, we see a preponderence of Rothschilds, Oppenheimers, Winogradskis and Warburgs in the capitalist camp, while the communist camp is gaced by Bronsteins, Andropovs, Apfelbaums and Glucksteins.

However, it is not necessarily suggested that communism and capitalism are both part of some sinister alien conspiracy. But it is surely plain to see that communism and capitalism are both alien creeds which have nothing to offer the British worker except continued slavery.

ROCKING THE REDS

Rock Against Communism fanzine. Issue 3 out now. Send 40p for sample copy to 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

NICK GRIFFIN

MARXISM IS THE ENEMY OF THE WORKERS!

IT IS CLEAR even to the casual observer that the Communist and Red Socialist leaders in Britain today do not really give a damn about the British working class.

Coloured immigration was designed to undercut our wages and weaken our trade unions. Rather than resist this attack on working people, Communist groups and the Labour Party have been at the forefront of the campaign to encourage immigration and "positive discrimination" against White workers.

Imports of manufactured goods are making huge profits for international capital, but are destroying whole industries in Britain. Trade unions, small manufacturers and ordinary workers are demanding action to halt this, but the Socialist Workers Party is sabotaging their campaign. Its argument against selected import controls are identical to those of Mrs. Thatcher.

Labour Party MPs regularly support the I.R.A. But these murderers not only shoot working class soldiers in the back and blow innocent women and children to pieces, they are also waging a war of imperialist aggression against one million Ulster Loyalists.

Time after time Marxist rhetoric about the "working class" is exposed as a hollow sham; all the Reds really care about is power!

Nor is this attitude confined to present day Britain. From the bourgeois snob Karl Marx, right up to the slave camps of modern Russia, the pattern is the same.

In the name of "proletarian internationalism", Soviet tanks and Communist secret police have crushed workers fighting for freedom in almost every country in Eastern Europe: East Berlin in 1953; Hungary in 1956; Czechoslovakia in 1968; Poland in 1956, 1970, 1976 and this year as well. Revolts in Bulgaria, the Baltic states and even inside Russia have also been drowned in the blood of workers and peasants.

GENOCIDAL

The North Vietnamse Communists (darlings of Western liberals in the 1960s) butchered 10,000 rebel peasants in the Red River Revolt of 1956. China has murdered tens of millions of her own people, as well as waging genocidal wars against minority nations such as the Ulgur Moslems and the Tibetans.

In Nicaragua today, many national revolutionary Sandinista guerillas have taken up arms again – this time against their Marxist wing which controls the new government and is using terror to set up a bureaucratic dictatorship.

The lesson is clear: Communism brings brutality and death, not only to its enemies, but also to the workers it is supposed to liberate.

Many of the Marxist groups in Britain today, including the SWP and WRP, try to dodge this issue by blaming Stalin for "betraying the Russian revolution". They argue that Communism was perverted by Stalin when he ousted Trotsky and set up a "State Capitalist" dictatorship.

It is certainly true that Marxism leads to State Capitalism , but it is NOT true that Trotsky was innocent, or that Trotskyism is any different to the other Red sects.

TROTSKY

It was Trotsky who built up the Red Army and, with a little help from his friends on Wall Street, defeated the White Russians in the 1918-21 Civil War. During the early part of the war, Trotsky and Lenin allied the Bolsheviks with other anti-Czarist forces such as the Social Revolutionaries (government partners 1917-18), independent Menshevik Georgia and the Makhno anarchists in the Ukraine. The latter were treaty allies who saved the Soviets in 1919 by defeating the White general Denikin. But they were just as opposed to State slavery as they were to wage slavery. The idea of independent nations comprised of workers and peasants controlling their own factories and land outraged Lenin and Trotsky. They treacherously turned the Red Army and the Cheka (secret police) against their former allies and exterminated them. Over 1/4 million Makhnovist peasants and workers were murdered in the Southern Ukraine in 1921 alone on the orders of Trotsky, the Commissar for War.

In the same year, the sailors, soldiers and workers at Russia's Kronstadt naval base rebelled against the Communist Party regime. Their views were expressed through their own newspapers and radio station. These totally demolished the lie that Trotsky was somehow different to the other Communist butchers:

"A new slavery has taken root. The peasant has been transformed into a serf in the 'Soviet' economy. The worker is becoming a simple wageworker in the State factories. The stratum of intellectual workers has been almost completely exterminated. Those who wanted to protest have been thrown into the jails of the Cheka. And those who continued to act were lined up against the wall. Russia in its entirety has been transformed into an immense prison. This has become insupportable. Revolutionary Kronstadt has been the first to break the chains and bars of the prison."

(Revolutionary Kronstadt 'News', March 1921.)

DEFIANT

Trotsky was in personal command of the Red Army cadets who moved against the rebels. As his forces closed in on March 8th 1921, the doomed rebels issued a defiant radio message:

"The first cannon shot has just been fired. 'Field Marshal' Trotsky, stained with the blood of the workers, was the first to fire on revolutionary Kronstadt which has risen against the Communist autocracy to re-establish the true power of the Soviets... The workers of the whole world will be our judges. The blood of the innocent will fall upon the heads of the Communists, crazy fools who are drunk with power!"

Trotsky exterminated the rebels with the utmost brutality and sadistic pleasure.

So it doesn't matter which Communist sect is involved. All of them have wallowed in the blood, not only of their "class enemies", but also of the workers they claim to admire. Why?

One reason is obvious. From Marx, Engels, Trotsky (Bronstein), Bela Kuhn in Hungary and Rosa Luxemburg in Germany, right up to Tony Cliff (Ygael Gluckstein) and the rest of his family running the S.W.P. in Britain today, the most fanatical Communist leaders have been Jews.

Imbued as they are with messianic urges and an age-old contempt for Gentiles, this is not surprising. Nor is it strange that such people have no feelings for the inhabitants of the countries in which they operate.

But this is not always the case. Some Communists are genuine, though misled, idealists. Yet they can do nothing to stop the growth of a brutal bureaucratic dictatorship, as hostile to the workers as it is to everyone else.

IMPERIALIST GREED

This is the unavoidable product of the basic tenets of Communist ideology. The Marxist sees the whole of history and human existence as an inevitable progression of economic changes. Impersonal economic forces decide what everybody thinks and how everybody acts. All the nobler facets of human nature are denied: self-sacrifice, philosophy, freedom, patriotism and love – all are reduced to reflections of materialistic greed.

But by making everything the result of inevitable historic processes, Marxism makes the **individual** – person or nation – irrelevant. The actual **worker** means nothing; it is the abstract concept of the "working class" which matters. Moreover, national and racial consciousness is rejected as a capitalist ploy to divide the "workers of the world". As the Marxists reject the very idea of the Nation, they cannot identify with the workers of any particular country, especially their own. If British workers have to suffer immigration and unemployment in the name of "international revolution", that's just tough luck!

Communism, like Capitalism, treats the individual workers as a cog in the machine, to be used until worn out, then scrapped. The Capitalists do it in the name of profit, the Reds do it in the name of historical prgress. Both are materialistic and equally unpleasant for us "cogs".

The ideology of Radical Nationalism, in total contrast, is based not on sentimental attachment to a mythical world family, but on love of a real community, linked by race, language, history, culture and tradition. Our creed is in touch with, and relevant to, the hopes and fears of our own kinfolk. This is what will unite all those who really care about are Nation. They will come from all walks of life and from all political persuasions. Some are at present Communists. To all of them we offer our vision. COMRADES, COME TO US!

WHICH WAY FORWARD FOR THE WORKERS?

THE writer of this article is a former member of the Socialist Workers Party and the Anti-Nazi League but he left these organisations when he became completely disillusioned with his Marxist beliefs. In the early part of last year, after reading a copy of Nationalism Today, *he realised the error of his ways and he joined the National Front.*

In this article he describes why he thinks communism is wrong and why he thinks radical nationalism is the ONLY alternative to international capitalism.

AS capitalism collapses it is the white working class who are feeling the brunt of the crisis. For them there is no inflation proof pension or a tax evasive Swiss bank account, or even a stately home to sell. For the working class it is wage cuts or the dole. These are the people that a radical nationalist party must attract. Only these people have the tradition of muscle and struggle, much misused by corrupt union leaders, who can take on and destroy capitalism. Radical nationalism must show that it has the true theory of revolution, not communism.

In marxist theory, capitalism was an economic progression from feudalism, as communism was from capitalism. Communism has failed.

The U.S.S.R. is a state capitalist tyranny, it enslaves its own people, and any others that fall under its so-called "sphere of influence". No nation that has turned communist has remained an independent nation state. The countries of the Eastern bloc are just glove puppets caught on barbed wire.

Communism has lost its right to stand as a solution to capitalism. State and finance capitalism are both international; the solution is a national one. A movement dedicated to national liberation and revolution is the only answer for the white working class.

We must also show that until we stop being a glove puppet for the U.S.A. and their corrupt multinational ideology, we will never control our own destiny. It is their sick culture (if you can call it that) which presents the most danger to our way of life, as much as Pakistani shopkeepers or Bengali cinemas, and we will never get rid of the one without the other.

Immigration, like the common market, is just part of the multi-national capitalist progression towards cheaper labour and bigger markets. For a nation to survive in this kind of world our workers would have to bring their labour in line with the Third World sweat shops. They would have to work for our equivalent of a bowl of rice a day. As the C.B.I. admits, wage control will last forever if we are to be "competitive". Competitive with slave labour, that's the free enterprise system we will be fighting against.

It could be said that the working class have three choices: the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. or the U.K. Yet the choice is even smaller. America and Russia, for all their talk, are becoming closer. Aid between the two tyrannies is increasing and the banks as much as the Kremlin wanted the Polish workers crushed.

Both systems are basically the same. In the U.S.A. you have the shareholders and the board of directors, in Russia the party members (a tiny part of the population) and the politburo. If there is a war between them, it will be a war of economic expansion, not ideology. A battle between a huge Marks and Spencer's and a state run railway. The choice for the white worker, therefore, has to be radical nationalism.

In far too many workers' minds the National Front has been seen as some sort of right wing Tory party. The N.F. must not allow itself to be associated with the pathetic nobodies that call themselves the right. It is these traitors more than the communists, who have sold us out.

It was the "Right" that allowed immigration, the E.E.C. and N.A.T.O.

For too long the theory that nationalist parties are used by capitalism to smash the working class in times of crises has ruled. The National Front must take up the challenge, it can be the party that is the expression and the weapon with which the working class must smash capitalism, so freeing the nation from a bland and soulless wage slavery. Thus giving us all national liberation.

SMASH COMMUNISM—JOIN THE N.F.!

To: National Front, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

☐ *I wish to become a Full Member of the National Front and enclose £6 for membership.*

☐ *Please send me further details of the National Front. I enclose 50p for an information pack.*

Tick appropriate box.

Name .....

Address .....

.....

THE *REAL* ALTERNATIVE

■ **Neither capitalist control nor state control, but workers' control!** The National Front believes that industrial freedom can only come about when the workers have a real say in the control of the places where they work. As a result we totally reject both capitalism, which puts all control in the hands of a few very powerful bosses, and communism, which gives all power to a handful of State bureaucrats and Party bosses. Instead we advocate an economy where workers co-operatives compete with **small** privately owned concerns in an environment completely free from the encroachment of Big Business.

■ **Stop imported immigrant labour from undercutting the wages of White workers!** The National Front believes that coloured immigrants were brought here as a source of cheap labour. They are being used to keep down the wages of British workers. We demand the stopping of all further immigration and the return of all coloured immigrants and their descendants to their land of ethnic origin.

■ **Free Great Britain from American control!** The National Front believes that Britain has no more in common with the capitalism of America than we do with the communism of Russia. We want Britain to be a strong, proud and independent nation free from **all** foreign control. As a result we advocate the withdrawal of Britain from all internationalist institutions, such as Nato, the Common Market and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

NATIONALISM TODAY *The Radical Voice of British Nationalism*

This supplement was produced as part of *Nationalism Today*, a 20-page magazine which supports the National Front. Subscriptions are available for 12 issues, priced £7.00. Cheques/Postal Orders made payable to "Nationalism Today". Send to: NT, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

Printed and published by N.T. Press, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

National Front wins court victories

THE National Front has won a number of very important legal and moral victories in the courts over the last couple of months.

The first of these victories was won in the High Court during the run up to last October's Peckham by-election. The Labour Party Reds on Southwark council had refused to grant the N.F. candidate in the election, Martin Webster, a council-owned hall which he had requested in order to be able to hold a public election meeting. This was an outrageous denial of the National Front's right to free speech during elections and Martin Webster was determined to see to it that the NF's rights were upheld. He took the Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Southwark to the High Court where he obtained a Court Order that the NF's candidates in Parliamentary elections are **absolutely entitled** to hire suitable halls for public election meetings under the terms of the Representation of the People Act of 1949.

The High Court also ruled that local authorities have no discretion under the Act to refuse such hall hire applications and that when a local authority refuses to comply with a Court Order in the matter of hiring a hall to a duly-nominated NF candidate the Court can issue an Order for sequestration and empower the High Court Tipstaff to break open the hall concerned so as to make it available for the NF candidate.

This High Court ruling signifies a major victory for the National Front. NF candidates have for years been unlawfully and arbitrarily denied their rights under the Representation of the People Act, but during the Peckham by-election campaign the Front took the necessary action required to uphold their legal rights and they won the day hands down!

This will prove a precedent case of great benefit for the NF in future by-elections and in the forthcoming General Election. For instance, should Southwark Council attempt to deny a hall to Jim Sneath, the NF candidate in the forthcoming Bermondsey by-election, the Party will go direct to the High Court and secure a Mandatory Injunction which, if it is not complied with, will certainly result in the relevant members and/or officers of Southwark Council being Committed for Contempt of Court!

This great victory for the NF was followed by two more High Court victories for the Party in the High Court over the following month. One of these victories was absolute while the other was more of a moral victory.

The absolute victory came in the case of Richard Verrall versus the Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Hackney, in which the NF successfully refuted in the High Court of Appeal that it was liable for any part of the rates debt which accumulated in respect of Excalibur House – a sum amounting to in excess of £10,000.

The moral victory came in respect of Anti-Nazi League organiser Peter Hain's libel action against Martin Webster, in which the High Court 'awarded' Hain the derisory sum of five pounds in 'damages'.

Media Watch



AT a time when Britain has just been "blessed" with an additional television channel it would seem apt that Nationalism Today *should introduce a new feature specifically designed to monitor the propaganda which spews forth incessantly from our televisions, radios and newspapers. "Media Watch" will appear on an occasional basis and will give examples of media poison and media brainwashing techniques.*

THE NEW Channel 4 was advertised as being designed for "minorities". To make it quite clear what kind of "minorities" would be involved, the new station is headed by a Mr. Jeremy Isaacs. As it turns out, one of the smallest minorities in the country are the viewers of Channel 4 itself. Little more than one in twenty of the population bother to watch it.

Looking at the sort of programmes the new channel puts out, the reason for this lack of interest becomes clear.

On one evening alone, Channel 4 churned out a film about the problems facing an Asian immigrant in Britain; a Danish film about a 70 year old American negress fighting against racism and sexism (why not ageism???); followed, for the benefit of anyone still watching, by an hour-long news magazine for the Asian community.

KIM GORDON

N.T. **readers who recall the riots which accompanied the National Front march through Lewisham in 1977 may be intrigued to learn that the presenter of C4's regular 'Black slot' "Black On Black" is none other than our old friend Kim Gordon. Mr. Kim Gordon, it will be remembered, was one of the main people involved in the build up to those riots. He was a leading member of the Socialist Workers Party, even boasting a place on their central governing body. He can proudly claim to be half-Jewish as well as being half-Black which should give him top credentials for the role of presenter on one of Mr. Isaacs' "multi-cultural" masterpieces. What more could Mr. Isaacs possibly ask for than a communist half-caste with Jewish blood!**

But Kim Gordon's spot is only the tip of the multi-cultural iceberg. We've also been blessed over the last couple of months with a six-part documentary on reggae music; six films on Black and Asian dance; ten programmes called the best of Black Art Entertainment; a Sunday matineee series of popular Indian films; six documentaries on ethnic minority artists in Britain; two films by the Federation of Bangladeshi Youth; and a documentary series about the influence of African music.

STILL NOT ENOUGH BLACKS

But it seems that three hours an evening isn't enough for the Commission for Racial Equality. In a report by the CRE called *T.V. in a Multi-Racial Society*, Muhammad Anwar and Anthony Shang complain that not enough Coloured actors appear on television. Furthermore "it is doubtful that the majority of the roles which are portrayed contribute towards racial harmony in our society".

The report complained that too often Blacks were only allowed to play bus drivers and tea ladies. Africans were linked with witchcraft and West Indians with crime and prostitution.

And, if the actor was Asian, his role would involve drug trafficking or illegal immigration.

The report also said: 'No doubt the BBC's *Till Death Us Do Part* gave respectability to words like "nigger", "sambo" and "coon", and ethnic minorities were presented as a threat to British society.

'Similarly, Eddie Booth in *Love Thy Neighbour* used nicknames such as "coon", "chocolate drop", and the "gorilla from Manila" to refer to Bill, his Black neighbour.'

The report complained also that in *Only When I Laugh*, from Yorkshire TV, the Asian male nurse, Gupta, appears to have the IQ of a chimp.

And ITV were attacked for productions using offensive terms like 'darkie', 'dago' and 'golliwog'.

Other programmes criticised include *Crossroads, Coronation Street* and *It Ain't Half Hot, Mum.*

The report called finally for less typecasting and a better chance for ethnic minorities to become actors, producers, writers, news readers, presenters and technicians.

One slight problem might arise. The report quotes various producers and directors as to why "so few" Black actors appear. They complain that it really isn't on to have a Black Henry VIII or an Asian Queen Victoria. Some even go so far as to question their ability:

"They are not very good. They don't understand the profession" "We have only done one play with coloured actors. It was disastrous; they were very noisy and they don't like to learn their lines properly." "Some producers don't like to put them in because the viewers can't understand what they're saying."

This last point suggests that Channel 4 is the right place for Coloured actors after all. Because as no-one watches it anyway, it won't really matter if all the programmes are in Swahili!

BOOK SHELF

A LOOK AT THE LATEST READING

THE IDENTITY OF ULSTER

BY IAN ADAMSON

Reviewed by TOM ACTON

WHAT happens when someone with deeply nationalistic political instincts writes about Ulster if he is imbued with a blind acceptance of liberal political values and attitudes?

The answer is that he writes a book like *The Identity of Ulster* – three quarters good to excellent, yet one quarter confused and contradictory. This well produced and excellently illustrated volume is as interesting for its bad points as its good, since they illustrate both the best and worst aspects of much of contemporary Loyalist opinion.

The first eight chapters consist of Ulster's history from the early years of the Christian era to the present day. Concisely and fairly Ian Adamson chronicles the facts of Ulster's past – facts that destroy the historical myths disseminated by "United Ireland" propagandists in the Irish Republican movement, and indeed in the British Establishment.

All too often one hears the view that "Ireland was once an independant united nation – although they're violent the IRA do have a just cause". Frequently such sentiments are voiced – not by Republican extremists – but by ordinary British people on the mainland whose understanding of the historical development of Ulster has been provided by the likes of the *Daily 'Troops out of Ireland' Mirror*. Consequently this book can be commended to all British Nationalists as it provides many of the hard facts that will enable them to effectively argue the Loyalist case on the mainland.

One wonders for instance how many people are aware that from the days of the Uluti, one of the ethnically Cruthinic peoples who inhabited much of Ulster and Northern Britain in ancient times, despite many population movements, including those caused by the Gaelic invasion of Southern Ireland, Ulster has always constituted a distinctive political, cultural and ethnic entity, separate from Ireland. Although Ulster's borders have varied greatly at no time was it ever part of a homogenous 'United Irish' nation.

CLOSE LINKS

Ulster however has always had close links with mainland Britain. Indeed Ulster and Southwest Scotland once formed the single nation of Dalriada, and there has been frequent movement of peoples between Ulster and Scotland ever since. As Adamson points out, during the 17th century Ulster Plantations, most settlers were Lowland Scots, merely returning to the land of their ancestors.

Adamson is generally fair and enlightening when dealing with the religious differences that shaped Ulster's development from the 17th century onwards, and shows how simplistic is the conventional view that Ulster's history is simply a permanent battle between Protestants and Catholics.

Unfortunately though whenever Adamson departs from Ulster's history and dwells on contemporary political issues he becomes horribly confused. Passages abound where Adamson makes sound nationalist statements, coupled with liberal *cliches* condemning nationalism. For example he describes Nationality as *"the type of civilisation which a people had developed which had become that people's tradition and is distinctive of their people's"*, adding that the world does not suffer from the diversity of national civilisations. Yet instead of commending nationalism as the political creed which seeks to maintain distinctive national civilisations he condemns it for representing *'localised statism'*, and then makes obscure references to Nazi Germany.

Although the author's treatment of history is implicitly, and probably unconsciously, nationalistic many of his political comments are explicitly anti-nationalist. One of the book's principal conclusions is that as Ulster and Ireland have differing histories, cultures, social patterns and ethnological roots they can never form a single homogenous people, yet it claims that Asian and West Indian immigration constitutes cultural enrichement – which is simply inane. Whatever the difference between Ulster and Irish folk they are negligible compared with those between Ulster people and Non-Europeans.

DISAFFECTED MINORITIES

Adamson's failure to appreciate that Non-European immigration inevitably leads to the growth of disaffected minority communities is surprising considering that his comments about the Republican minority in Ulster are so obviously also applicable to the mainland's immigrant communities. Answering Republican claims that they are treated as second-class citizens he quotes the view that *"much of the blame must fall on those who have behaved as if they were not citizens at all and conspired against institutions cherished by the vast majority"*.

Adamson's views on certain social policies are however to be commended. On the subject of industrial ownership he quotes the example – well known to many NF members – of Swedish and Basque co-operatives, and his views on the importance of developing workers' co-operatives are very similar to those of the National Front.

Nonetheless the overall impression that one gets from this book is that, although it successfully answers those who would have Ulster absorbed into an 'All-Ireland' state, it is flawed by the author's lack of a consistent and coherent political standpoint, and also his acceptance of 'liberal-consensus' solutions to most political problems, other than those specific to Ulster – a fault common perhaps to many Ulster Loyalists.

One consequence of this is that both Adamson and a substantial number of Loyalists now favour the creation of a separate Ulster state, for what seem to be very debatable reasons. Adamson argues that Ulster's identity is being crushed between rival Irish and (mainland) British Nationalisms, citing the decline in Ulster Lallans and Ulster Gaelic as evidence of the destruction of a distinctive Ulster culture. He also points out, rightly, that successive British Governments have been indifferent to Ulster's needs.

DISCRIMINATION

These arguments have much validity – but they are far from conclusive.

Firstly: Although British Governments have discriminated against Ulster, they have been almost as indifferent to the needs of British people on the mainland. Try telling a jobless Consett steelworker that Parliament is full of 'British Nationalist' M.P.'s as his employment prospects disappear into oblivion, thanks to the Government's treacherous acceptance of EEC 'rationalisation' schemes. If a genuine British Nationalist Government were to be elected it would care equally for the people of all parts of the United Kingdom.

Secondly: Ulster's linguistic and cultural problems are symptomatic of those of all distinctive national cultures currently under attack by materialist international capitalism. A Stormont Government would be of no help to Ulster if it adopted the conventional liberal internationalist policies, practised at present by all Western European governments. Radical Nationalists are however committed to the preservation and development of indigenous local languages, customs and cultures, recognising that the destruction of local identities by state centralism is as evil as the destruction of national identities by internationalism.

Adamson has written at length of Ulster's centuries-old bonds with mainland Britain. These bonds are themselves an integral part of Ulster's traditions. The peoples of Ulster and mainland Britain have so much in common it would be tragic if Ulster broke the Union between us as a result of the treacherous and stupid policies of successive British Governments.

The Identity of Ulster is available from Nationalist Books, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF for £3.85 plus 38p postage.

MARTIN WEBSTER

Trouble shooting

PETER HAIN'S 'FIVER'

ON Friday 19th November the Jury in the trial of Peter Hain's High Court libel action against me was out for seven hours before it arrived at a 10/2 majority verdict 'in favour' of Mr. Hain and awarded him derisory damages of £5.

While the Jury was out I hob-nobbed with a number of journalists including one man who said that he was a reporter for a news agency which specialised in coverage of High Court actions. During our conversation he let slip a comment, the significance of which I did not at the time appreciate:

"Of course with these libel cases, what is published by the media efter the trial is often far more important for the people involved than the actual decisions of the Court."

The significance of this remark hit me later that evening and the following morning on hearing and seeing the output of the broadcasting media and press about the outcome of the trial.

There was, of course, variance of detail in the media's reports – **but one plain lie was common to them all: the statement that the Court "ordered Mr. Webster to pay Peter Hain's costs estimated at between £15,000 and £20,000".**

No such Order was made by the Court.

Numerous reporters were in Court and heard precisely what the Judge did direct as to costs. So how and why did the **whole** of the media feed the public with a deliberate lie?

As to **how** – we in the NF have long experience of the fact that where the National Front is concerned (and, indeed, where Hain and his campaigns are concerned) media outlets have long been co-ordinated to respond to "background briefings" from sources which, by common consent, are regarded as "authoritative".

Sometimes these briefings emanate from the senior political editors of the Press Association news agency (to which all major news publishing/broadcasting entities subscribe); sometimes they come from Home Office mandarins; sometimes from Scotland Yard; sometimes from unofficial but influential bodies like the Board of Deputies of British Jews.

ORCHESTRATED 'LINE'

In emergencies news editors will respond to a 'line' in respect of a particular incident flashed to them over their Press Association teleprinters. The outcome of the Hain libel action was just such an emergency.

It was by this process that the **whole** of the news media was orchestrated to repeat the Big Lie about the non-existent "£20,000 costs awarded".

As to **why** that lie was told, the answer – to anybody who has followed Peter Hain's media-puffed career for the past 14 years will be obvious:

Peter Hain, the "idealistic" Golden-Boy of the world's multi-racialist media, issued a Writ for Libel against the infamous arch-racist Martin Webster of the notorious National Front. The pig-headed brute Webster refused to give in and settle out of Court, so he faced a public thrashing in Court by means of a damages award – the more so since the racist oaf proposed to be impudent enough to defend himself in person against a veritable tribe of brilliant Jewish lawyers led by Turner-Samuel Q.C.

Here was sport indeed!

Not only that, here was a splendid opportunity for super-hero Hain to complete his transformation from the "controversial" young demo organiser of yesteryear into the "mature and respectable" Labour Party politician of tomorrow!

What a wonderful package of goodies the media hacks smacked their lips over as the trial began on Monday 15th November.

But as the days of the trial slipped by, as I presented my defence of "justification" (Hain was under cross-examination for a day and a half) it was clear from the sour faces of Hain, his lawyers and the hacks, that things were **not** going according to their expectations. This became even plainer during the incredible seven hour wait for the Jury's verdict.

Counsel for Hain had maintained during the trial that I had published **four** "serious libels" about his client, and that I had "aggravated" the "seriousness" of the libels by the means I adopted to defend myself.

Yet towards the end of the seven hour wait for the Jury he suggested to the Judge that he would be content if the Jury could come to a decision in respect of just **one** of the alleged libels!

INSULTING AWARD

In the event, the Jury did 'find' for Hain by a majority verdict – but then awarded him derisory damages of £5. This was plainly more of an insult to Hain than an award. When a man goes to Court over libel his prime aim is to win a sufficiantly large award for damages to establish that the item published about him had, in the words of Libel Law, "lowered him in the minds of right-thinking people".

In awarding Hain £5 the Jury told him and the world that his standing in the community was such that any damage done to him by the "serious and aggravated libels" that I had published could be fully repaired by a fiver!

After the trial Hain, of course, told the media that he had only sought a "modest" sum. That is not true. His Counsel applied for **"moderate"** damages – a word which in legal circles is taken to indicate a four-figure sum of about £5,000.

Once the Jury had done their bit, Hain's Counsel **applied** for all his client's costs to be awarded against me, but after representations from me, **the Judge did not grant a costs Order in those terms.**

Instead, he declared that he would notify the High Court Taxing Master (the junior Judge who settles questions of costs) to reduce or scale down any application for costs against me in the view of the "very low" award for damages and in view of the "very long time" Hain took to bring the action to trial.

It may be that Hain has run up a £20,000 bill with his tribe of lawyers. That is something he will have to settle with them. The difference between that sum and what I may be Ordered by the Taxing Master to pay by way of costs may be considerable.

PUBLIC HUMILIATION

Not only did Hain **not** get all of his costs awarded against me – he was not able (indeed, his Counsel did not even **apply**) to have me Injuncted not to republish **any** of the four statements complained of. His Counsel only applied for me to be Injuncted in respect of **one** of the four statements (i.e. the wrong statement involving the criminal terrorist John Harris).

So while Hain just about scraped home with the verdict, from the political and moral point of view he and the vile cause that he represents experienced a public humiliation. People do not involve themselves in £20,000 libel actions to be told that their standing in the community is only worth a fiver and to have their costs claims subjected to Judicial restrictions.

Inevitably the media was not prepared to make clear the plain fact that Hain had experienced a moral and political defeat at the hands of a British racial nationalist. They are only prepared to report "victories" for their *protegees* and "defeats" for us... and if they have to go to the lengths of inventing and 'reporting' Court Orders that were never made, then they will do so.

(Some publications not only 'reported' the false "£20,000 costs Order", but refrained from mentioning the **fact** that the Jury only awarded Hain £5 – the central issue which the Jury had to determine after 'finding' for the plaintiff! One can imagine the gloating headlines and sneering reports had I sued Peter Hain, but only won £5 damages!)

The question readers now must keep in mind every time they turn on the TV or radio news, or open a newspaper, is this:

If the mass media can be co-ordinated to promote a flagrant lie about the outcome of a libel action, then what other lies are the media being co-ordinated to tell the public, day after day, about very much more important issues?

NF CALENDARS

£2.50 plus 94p postage from 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

READERS' LETTERS

All letters to *Nationalism Today* should be addressed to The Editor, *Nationalism Today*, 50 Pawsons Rd., Croydon, Surrey, CRO 2QF.

BRITISH TELECOM

Dear *N.T.*,

As an employee of British Telecom, I think *Nationalism Today* might be interested in Thatcher's plans to sell off B.T. – currently a successful nationalised industry, all of whose profits go back into the business to invest in a high technology future.

More money is needed, but instead of cutting off aid to Blacks, the Common Market etc to provide investment, Thatcher and the Tories say that we must borrow the money from the bankers, and we can only do that by being sold off as a private company, as it would otherwise bump up the Public Sector borrowing figures.

As the magazines enclosed show, all the Tories really want to do is to get in a bit of cash on the quick for themselves and whoever else is able to buy shares on the cheap. The company could end up foreign-controlled and, at the very least, lots of jobs would be lost as we'd have to go abroad for most of our equipment so as to be able to give shareholders a return on their money.

Basically, Thatcher and Tebbit couldn't give a damn about British workers or their jobs, and hate to see anything like trade unions or the National Front which might act as a rallying point for White youths.

This is a big issue and I hope you will be able to spare some space to go into it. "Public service, not private profit". Smash Thatcher and smash capitalism!

Love,

Valerie,
(A regular reader),
Maidstone, Kent.

SUGGESTIONS

Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed a cheque for £10.50 towards the Fighting Fund.

Below are some suggestions you may like to consider for inclusion in future issues of *N.T.*:

1) *N.T.* supplements like the supplement in issue 6. These could cover a wide range of topics such as Race Riots, Banks and Inflation, Communism, Industry etc. All in a clear, concise, easy-to-read format they should be a good source of recruitment.

2) A 'T.V. Eye'. A brief look in each issue at some of the more subtle and not-so-subtle instances of media distortion over the past month.

3) Many American publications are extremely informative and thought provoking eg *Instauration, National Vanguard, Spotlight* etc. I'm sure that selected articles reprinted in *N.T.* would go down well.

That's it, except to congratulate everyone concerned with *Nationalism Today*. It is a fine magazine and will serve the Party well.

Yours faithfully,

David Gobell,
Essex.

RACIST ATTITUDES

Dear Sir,

I wonder if you saw the BBC programme *Anglo-Saxon Attitudes* which was broadcast recently. It was certainly the best laugh I've had for a while!

The programme, as well as providing some excuses for the recent Black riots (discrimination etc. – the usual rubbish), concentrated mainly on a group of degenerate left-wing 'teachers' attending a 'seminar' on racism. This seminar was designed to reveal "latent racist attitudes" in the creatures involved. After the seminar, one of the 'teachers' shrieked with horror and said "I didn't know I was such a racist!"

This sort of laughable behaviour surely illustrates that these mind poisoners are bankrupt of ideas. The views concerning multi-racialism which were voiced during the programme could easily have been demolished by someone with very little knowledge of racial differences.

The Establishment must be desperate if they have to screen the antics of idiots to convey the multi-racial message.

Yours faithfully,

J. K. Wilshaw,
Cumbria.

HOUSING SCANDAL

Dear Sir,

It was recently revealed by a local newspaper in Surrey that a white couple and their baby son are living in what can only be described as a slum – and the local Tory council will do nothing to help them.

The flat in Kingston, owned by an untraceable private landlord, is literally falling to pieces. Neighbours report masonry falling onto the pavement, the family's toilet – shared with two other flats – fell through the floorboards and in the same week a meal had to be thrown into the dustbin because it was crawling with cockroaches. Not surprisingly, both mother and child are suffering from severe ill-health.

Trevor and Janet Lucas and their seven-month old son are clearly living in a state that no civilised people could tolerate, yet the local council refuses to re-house them and they are likely to be living in squalor for another five years. The reaction of Kingston Council's housing manager was one of total disinterest. He stated that the family did not have enough points to enable them to make an offer of accomodation. There were priority cases above them.

It does not take much imagination to guess what a "priority" case is, and what "points" might ensure that a local council takes good care of you. If the family concerned had been Black or Asian they would have been rehoused immediately, such is the perverse, cringing, immigrant-loving attitude of most local councils in Britain today.

Paul Decon,
Surrey.

THE BANKERS' MACHINATIONS

Dear Sir,

Full marks to Steve Brady for his typically vibrant, well-researched and informative article "Does the Militant Tendency Know too much" in No. 12 of *Nationalism Today*. This reminded me of a very significant report in *The Spotlight*, the well known expose of Zionist machinations published by Liberty Lobby in Washington D.C. to the effect that the Militant Tendency here has made some indiscreet noises about "The Thing That Dare Not Speak It's Name" i.e. the banking and usury swindle always banned from any public hearing here in Britain. *The Spotlight* reports that this is the real reason the paymasters of the Labour Party have ordered the expulsion of Militant Tendency from the party, but, of course, this "delicate" subject has been eliminated from all reports in the censored and debased British media.

Yours faithfully,

Irene Astbury,
Sheffield.

GENOCIDE

Dear Editor,

In Lebanon, Israel is perpetrating a criminal act of genocide. Sparing no one, the aggressor's armed forces are actually exterminating Palestinians wholesale, and thousands of Lebanese are dying.

Terror, tested by Zionists in the past, is now official policy.

Yours for Racial Unity,

Robert Holford, Birmingham

TAKE NOTE

Dear Sir,

Nationalists in Britain should take note of the fate of the extreme right-wing "Fuerza Nueva" in Spain. Seven years after Franco's death, the party that until recently could count on 300,000 votes has dissolved itself!

The leader of the party, Blas Pinar, declared that the church had "abandoned" Fuerza Nueva and that the bosses are happy with the new system in Spain.

In Italy the M.S.I., another hyper-reactionary organisation, has ingratiated itself with the establishment.

Anyone tempted by the reactionary model of nationalism would do well to consider the lessons of Spain and Italy.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Walker,
London SW.

Rite Up

In Loving Memory

"Welcome to hell Mr. Brezhnev, I'm hoping you can give me a few hints!"

BREZHNEV and Napoleon meet in the next world.

"Oh-h-h, if only we'd had such a brilliant commander as yourself in the Soviet Union instead of Stalin," Brezhnev says to Napoleon, "then we wouldn't have allowed Hitler to cross our treshold."

"And if I had a newspapers like your Pravda," says Napoleon, "not a soul would have heard about Waterloo!"

* * * * * *

BEFORE he died Brezhnev's mother came to visit her son.

"This is my house," said Brezhnev, showing her around. "And this is my car. And that's my swimming pool. And this" – he shows her some photographs – "is my second house. And this is my aeroplane. And this is my villa on the Black Sea. And this is my yacht."

His mother gasps in wonder. "You do live well son," she says, "But I am nervous for you. What if the Communists get in?"

* * * * * *

A journalist asked Brezhnev whether he collected stories against himself.

"I certainly do," replied Brezhnev.

"Do you have many?" asked the journalist.

"Two camps full," said Brezhnev.

Police riot in Brixton

VIOLENCE erupted in Brixton recently when the police rioted for the third time in a month. Enlightened local Black liberals rushed to the scene as rampaging constables broke down doors, smashed windows and terrorised the local population.

Local Black intellectual, Brillo Mongoolabumi, said: "It's lucky that we had some petrol-bombs handy to defend ourselves with. One cafe was burned out, several cars destroyed and some policemen are in hospital. If we had not arrived, the disorder could have been serious."

This incident naturally raises questions about policing methods.

Some have suggested that arrests – particularly of Black people – are provocative and anti-social and should be banned by law. Others go further: For another Brixton-based Black intellectual, Agammernon Kraka Tonka-Toy III, says:

"I don't see why the Metropolitan Police should be allowed to walk the streets and take the law into their own hands. Law and Order should be left to the Black community – they're the only ones who know what it means."

New Annual Awards

THE 'Rite Up' column will be sponsoring a new range of Annual Awards to be presented at NF Annual General Meetings. Nominations for 1983 must be received by no later than 1st August. N.F. National Activities Organiser Martin Webster sets the ball rolling with his own suggestions.

Individual Awards:

The Martin Webster Award for Dieting and Even Temper.
The Andrew Brons Award for Making Abstract Points Fun.
The Ian Anderson Award for Building Bridges With Splinter Groups.
The Peter Williams Award for Relentless Sectarianism.
The Philip Gegan Award for Knowledge of High Court Practice.
The Michael Salt Award for Opposition to Pedantic Pettifogging.
The Graham John Award for Branch Development.
The R. Paul Matthews and Derek Holland Award for Trendy Ecumenism.
The Nick Griffin Award for Subtle Satire.
The Peggy Caine Award for Indifference to the Judeo-Masonic Plot.
The Joe Pearce Award for Sustained Application to Hard Work.
The Paul Johnson and Martin Wingfield Award for Maturity of Judgement.
The David Riley Award for National Activity Mobilisation.
The Steve Brady Award for the Suppression of Gossip.
The Des Fenwick Award for Optimism.
The Mike Turner Award for Contemplative Calmness.
The George Flaxton Award for Self-Confident Enthusiasm.
The Nick Barratt Award for Generosity and Co-operation.
The Alvin Hanson Award for Self-Effacing Anti-Materialism.
The Nick Wakeling Award for Overnight Visits.
The Jimmy Capes Award for Reactionary Tory Tendencies.
The Frank Burden Award for Non-Violence and Diplomatic Press Relations.
The Ken Guichard Award for Benign Tolerance of Youth Cults.
The Victor Logan Award for Useful Contributions to A.G.M.'s.
The Dave Smith Award for Total Abstinence.
The Mike Hipperson Award for Regional Organisation.
The Robert Young Award for Butch Hairstyles.
The Peter Lacey Award for Snappy Leaflet Writing.

Unit Awards:

The Southwark Branch Award for Orderly Conduct Outside Pubs.
The Hounslow Branch Award for Orderly Conduct Inside Pubs.
The Salford Group Award for Attentiveness at Branch Meetings.
The Rochdale Group Award for Subscription Renewals.
The N.W. Region Drum Corps Award for Reliability.
The NF Printer's Award for Sharpness of Photo Reproduction.

Industrial Front

Only militant action can save the Steel Industry

THE BRITISH steel industry is being murdered by cheap imports from other Common Market countries, Japan and South Africa. Yet nothing effective is being done by either management or workers to stem the import tide. In fact, management's only solution to the present plight of the industry, far from advocating the stemming of cheap imports, is to make even further closures of British steel plants.

Ian MacGregor, the chairman of the British Steel Corporation, says that "further substantial cuts" must be expected in the future. The result of these "substantial cuts" could be the closing of plants such as Ravenscraig in Scotland which would threaten more than 12,000 jobs in steel and associated industries around Strathclyde.

These further cuts are completely unacceptable, especially when it is realised that the numbers employed in steelmaking industries have already been more than halved from 182,000 to just 79,300 in the last five years.



Ian MacGregor: "12,000 more jobs must go."

UNACCEPTABLE

It is even more unacceptable when it is realised that our so-called partners in the Common Market are benefitting at the expense of the British worker by sending cheap steel to Britain. Since 1977, the French have only cut capacity by 1 per cent, the Belgians by only 3 per cent, the Germans by a mere half-per cent, while the Italians have actually increased capacity slightly. Meanwhile, in the same period, United Kingdom capacity has been cut by a massive 37 per cent! Our Common Market "partners" are exploiting the lack of tarrif barriers by undercutting British steel producers with cheap imports. The situation is exacerbated by the number of imports from Japan and South Africa.

But if management is acting outrageously in their complacent attitude to cheap imports, then the workers themselves are scarcely doing any better in their efforts to save their industry and their jobs. Mr. Bill Sirs, general secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, Britain's largest steel union, has seen quite correctly that the problem can only be resolved by the banning of steel imports from the EEC and elsewhere.

He has pointed out that over 3 million tonnes of steel is flooding into Britain every year from other Common Market countries, often at prices well below those officially agreed by the EEC. Yet he and his union are doing nothing effective to stop this dumping of cheap steel in Britain. The most that the ISTC has managed, under the leadership of Bill Sirs, is the selective picketting of individual ports in a vain attempt to stem the tide of imports. This has been completely ineffective since the ships carrying the steel are simply being diverted to other ports.

WASTE OF TIME

At best the union action has caused the foreign steel importers minor inconvenience, at worst it has been a complete waste of time and effort. What is needed is a militant approach to the problem which would involve the picketting of **every** port in order to stop any steel imports from entering the country. **The steel workers, if they are to protect what is left of the British steel industry, must be prepared to take any action which may prove necessary in order to stop imports from entering the country. If they are not prepared to do this, their jobs, their livelihoods and the whole British steel industry will be destroyed.**

Bill Sirs and all the other moderates in the Steel unions must be kicked out so that militant British workers can fight to save this vital British industry from imminent destruction!

TRADE UNIONISTS!

Keep Industrial Front informed! Send all Trade Union papers and journals to: N.T. (Industrial Front), 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey, CRO 2QF.

Workers' Co-ops work

WHILST Capitalist companies are going broke at a record rate, workers' co-operatives, free from wasteful conflict between workers and management because the workers **are** the management – are thriving. More are being set up all the time, and often co-operatives are able to help one another.

Last July, for example the London taxi drivers' co-op Met Cabs were able to take 15 Welsh workers, made redundant earlier this year, off the dole by agreeing to act as distributors for the Welshmen's proposed car components co-op. As a result the Welshmen were able to obtain the £40,000 loan from the local authority and the Development Board for Rural Wales to get their new co-op, Aberystwyth Engineering, off the ground. Met Cabs in turn benefit, creating three new jobs out of distributing the Welsh-made king-pin sets, brake drums and half shafts.

And the benefits don't stop there. Other London cabbies will get cheaper parts: Met Cab spokesman Ron Cooper said: "We shall be selling the goods – mainly to other taxi cab firms – at very competitive prices. We may be able to sell some items for as little as half the retail price charged in some parts of the country." A turnover of £40,000 in the first year of trading is hoped for.

Meanwhile a new industry is laid in a part of Britain where lack of job opportunities and consequent drift of young people to the cities has imperilled a largely Welsh-speaking community. Thus this new venture helps preserve our cultural heritage and the ancient speech of Britain.

BUSINESS SENSE

So workers' co-ops aren't some trendy utopian fantasy. They make hard business sense, thanks to the good industrial relations and high productivity of a workforce which owns the plant in which it works and enjoys the profits its labour earns. And they offer an alternative to class strife and industrial warfare, an alternative whereby British workers can work together to create their own jobs and prosperity by their own efforts, rather than labouring to boost the profits of foreign multinationals and shareholding drones.

Given an NF Government with the will to positively help co-ops get started, and to defend them from the ravages of foreign imports and multinationals, Met Cabs, Aberystwyth Engineering and thousands of co-ops like them will be the standard-bearers of our industrial future, leading our nation on its long march out of the depths of Capitalist recession.

BRIGHT PROSPECTS FOR SCOTLAND

A series of articles by Ian Anderson focussing on individual branches and groups of the National Front.

THEY may have few Blacks and virtually no race riots as yet, but Scotland is suffering in other ways from the policies of successive Conservative and Labour Governments. Unemployment is soaring and is the worst in the United Kingdom apart from Ulster. Whole industries have collapsed and the decay in the inner city areas rivals anything south of the border.

While the advent of North Sea Oil has helped in one or two areas it is the multinational oil companies that are gaining most – not Scotland. For a time many Scottish voters were fooled by the superficial attraction of the Scottish National Party in the same way that some voters are still being fooled by the Social Democrats. But more and more Scotsmen have realised that the S.N.P. offers no real alternative to the old parties and that it fails to recognise, let alone tackle, the real problems facing Britain.

The National Front has had a toe-hold in Scotland for several years largely as a result of the hard work and loyalty of Mike Regan who until recently was the Scottish Organiser. During the early summer of 1982, after a difficult period when our membership was reduced to a small number of hard core members, we started to again receive a number of membership applications.

CONFERENCE

By September 1982 there were sufficient members to warrant the booking of a hotel room for a conference in Edinburgh. Delegates attended representing groups from Glasgow, Aberdeen, Fife, Dundee, Airdrie and Edinburgh. A discussion took place concerning the particular problems of recruiting in Scotland and it was felt that we would advance more rapidly if a specifically Scottish recruitment leaflet could be produced.

The delegates accepted that the money for such a leaflet would have to come from the Scottish Groups and it was decided to go ahead on this basis. The new leaflet is expected to be available early in 1983. **Many Scottish Groups feel a close tie with Ulster as can be seen from the Edinburgh banner featured on this page, and our opposition to the I.R.A. will certainly be a feature of this leaflet.**

Until it does become available activities were to be concentrated around paper sales, and now regular sales are held at Rangers, Hearts and at Dundee football grounds as well as High Street sales.

Because our membership in Scotland is still relatively small it has not as yet been possible to organise marches north of the border, but almost all national marches are attended by a Scottish delegation. **Members from towns such as Aberdeen and Dundee often have to travel all night for these events but their regular attendance is a sign of their dedication.**

SUBSTANTIAL HEADWAY

One area where we are making substantial headway in Scotland is in the universities; a very high proportion of our Scottish members are currently at university and recently Andrew Brons, Chairman of the National Front, was invited to speak at a debate at St. Andrew's University. Unable to prevent his attendance at this debate the Reds in the University had to content themselves with passing resolutions in the Student Union condemning the event after it had happened. They passed one resolution demanding that "a platform be denied racist speakers in the future". It seems a shame that as the meeting of the Students' Union was inquorate this motion will have no effect at all.

In the past we have had members in Scotland who were more interested in using the National Front to pursue their own personal political aims and this has occasionally led to serious internal disputes. Our key officials now are members whose sole political loyalty is to the National Front and this has enabled us to build up a proper organisation in Scotland.

With this solid basis the prospects for the N.F. in Scotland are looking very bright. We have groups operating in most major towns and cities and with units operating in both Wales and in Nothern Ireland the National Front is the only truly national political party which is offering a real alternative for the British people.

SOUTH AFRICAN PATRIOT

South Africa's leading racial nationalist magazine is now available from the National Front. Send 40p plus 15p postage to 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey, CRO 2QF.

N.T. SALES LEAGUE

NEWHAM N.F. is the best Branch in the country for selling *Nationalism Today* in bulk. Lambeth and Tower Hamlets are also selling well, but sales from outside London remain comparitively low. Only Leeds and Hemel Hempstead are represented in the top ten units for bulk sales, so it is hoped that orders from outside London will start to pick up.

The top ten units for selling *N.T.* are:

1. NEWHAM
2. LAMBETH
3. TOWER HAMLETS
4. Leeds
5. Hemel Hempstead
6. Wandsworth
7. Hounslow
8. Hackney
9. Barking
10. Havering.

GET IT REGULARLY!

Make sure you receive Nationalism Today promptly, every single issue. Take out a subscription today by filling in this form and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the correct amount.

Name .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

The following rates are for **12** issues (please tick as applicable): British Isles: **£7.00** ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail **£7.30** ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail **£10.70** ☐ Unsealed air mail, Middle East **£11.30** ☐ Unsealed air mail Canada, America, Africa **£12.20** ☐ Unsealed air mail Australia, New Zealand **£14.20** ☐ Half rates for 6 issues.

Please add 50p to foreign cheques as commission for our grasping bankers!

All cheques/P.O.'s should be made out to NATIONALISM TODAY and sent to: N.T., 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

STEVE BRADY

Britons must fight for Britain only!

ENOCH POWELL, darling of the reactionary Right, can have caused no few apoplectic harrumphs in Hove when he informed a meeting in Bristol of his conversion to the CND/Leftist doctrine of unilateral nuclear disarmament.

Arguing that in his view American nuclear weapons had not been the reason the Soviets have not overrun Western Europe during the last 35 years. Enoch went on:

"The proposition that possession of nuclear weapons deters attack upon, or blackmail of, the United Kingdom cannot be sustained. Britain can use nuclear weapons only in a case of life and death, and in a case of life and death it is too risky to use them."

More typical of the traditional Tory line was Margaret Thatcher speaking in the Commons on November 23rd. Commenting on her fellow-reactionary President Reagan's decision to litter the Wyoming prairies with MX missile siloes in the interest of peace, Britain's Prime Minister, clearly aware of Britain's true role in NATO, told MP's "It is not for us to tell the United States what to do." It is, in her view, seemingly for us, as humble vassals of Wall Street, to die loyally at the behest of the cowboy actor who now sits in the White House.

After all, the 'Iron Maiden' went on, American "strategic nuclear weapons are the final guarantee of Europe's liberty." No doubt she has been loyally closing her ears to numerous recent utterances from senior U.S. Government sources which make it less than wholly certain, to put it mildly, that America will unleash those strategic weapons, and risk the retaliatory devastation of the U.S. homeland, merely in defence of the "liberty" of her European satellites. We are expendable, it seems.



SUBSERVIENT

Thatcher's entire defence policy indeed is subservient to that of the U.S.A. She intends to equip Britain with the Trident nuclear missile system which can only be used as part of a general U.S.-Soviet global nuclear holocaust. And she is allowing the Americans to station nuclear-armed cruise missiles all over Britain, enabling the U.S. to attack the Soviets with their weapons under their control whilst we, not they, take the brunt of the Russian counterstrike.

In Thatcher's defence policy, it may not be for us to tell the United States what to do, but it would be for them to tell us when to die. A false alarm on a computer in Colorado, a blunder by the 'Sheriff of Canyon Gulch' ensconced in Washington, and thousands of years of proud history, our ancient nation and all her folk, could die in nuclear fire. More and more Britons are coming to see that: in November a Gallup poll showed 56% of our people oppose Trident and 58% the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles on our soil.

But unilateral nuclear disarmament, as put forward by the Labour Left and now by Enoch Powell, is not the answer. As Tory Foreign Secretary Francis Pym pointed out in Leeds on November 25th, even a non-nuclear Britain would be too important a NATO strategic base to be anything other than, as he put it, "a prime target" for Soviet atomic bombardement in a U.S.-Soviet war.

No, the answer to the threat of atomic annihilation is British withdrawal from NATO and an independent foreign policy not aligned to either hegemonist superpower as has been NF policy ever since our Party was founded in 1967. After all, what real difference to us, as racial nationalists, is there between multiracialist Capitalist America and multiracialist Communist Russia – save perhaps that multiracialist theory is put into racemixing practice considerably more in America than in the Soviet Union? If any difference does exist, is it so great that it is worth sacrificing our survival as a nation and a people to help the less evil enemy win? For that is the choice, between two evil, racially-destructive systems: Capitalism and Communism. And we need not choose either.

At the same time, we cannot give up our nuclear capability. Enoch is right to point out that a British Bomb is no deterrent if, as he implicitly assumes, it can only figure as a pawn in a deadly game of suicidal superpower chess, in which the major pieces are the atomic arsenals of the USA and the USSR. In fact, Pym's retort that we will be blasted anyway whether we have a Bomb or not is also right because under the present situation we are in effect little more than a giant American aircraft carrier moored off Western Europe. But a wholly independent British Bomb, to be used if and only if either superpower, or anyone else, attacks Britain, is a different matter. Both superpowers would then hesitate to involve our country in a war between them in which we would otherwise stay neutral. And either superpower, or the UN or whoever, will hesitate to intervene to overthrow a Nationalist Government here, if they know that the price for not leaving us alone as we would otherwise leave them alone will be the loss of at least several of their major cities. The searing of the sky over New York or Leningrad, Shanghai or Tel Aviv, with the thermonuclear fire that makes the Sun burn would likely prove too high a price even for smashing the hated 'racists'.

So the "final guarantor" of Britain's liberty is not American strategic nuclear missiles but British ones. And the guarantee of Britain's survival, even if the superpowers rend each other in a Third World War, is that those weapons will be used by Britons only in the defence of Britain, and Britain alone.

BUY N.T. IN BULK!

10 copies £ 3.50 + 94p post
20 copies £ 6.40 + £1.57p post
30 copies £ 9.60 + £1.57p post
40 copies £12.80 + £1.90p post
50 copies £14.50 + £1.90p post
60 copies £17.40 + £2.10p post
70 copies £20.30 + £2.10p post
80 copies £23.20 + £2.25p post
90 copies £26.10 + £2.25p post
100 copies £27.00 + £2.40p post
200-499 copies: 23p each)Postal rates apply
500 copies and over: 20p each for details

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Nationalism Today* and sent to *Nationalism Today*, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.

Printed and published by N.T. Press, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, Surrey CRO 2QF.